

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 8 and 13 has been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 3, 8 and 13 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested because it places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the Examiner for granting an interview on November 30, 2004. This reply has been prepared to reflect what was discussed in the interview.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, Claim 13 was objected to because of informalities. This objection is respectfully traversed because, in this response, claim 13 has been amended to replace “though” with --through--, as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Particularly, the Examiner stated that the specification and figures do not support “the connection

portion and join portion configured to be closer to the inner top surface of the through hole than the head portion”. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, claim 13 has been amended to recite “the head portion and the joint portion are *proximate to* the inner top surface of the through hole”. An example of this claimed feature is shown in Fig. 9 of the present application, in which the head portion 267c and the joint portion 267a are proximate to the inner top surface of the housing 268.

It is submitted that claim 13, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 13.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,108,318 issued to Sakurai, *et al.* (“Sakurai”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 1 and 2, independent claim 1 recites “the bending of the connection portion pushes *the head portion and the joint portion toward the inner top surface of* the through hole to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole”.

In this regard, the Examiner asserted that “AAPA discloses ... the engagement between the hanging jaw and the hanging projection push the head portion and the joint portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole ...” (Office Action, page 3). However, the Examiner admitted that AAPA “does not disclose a connection portion ... bent toward an inter top surface

of the through hole to retain movement of the body portion in the through hole ...” (Office Action, page 3).

Regarding this missing features, the Examiner asserted “Sakurai et al. discloses a connection portion ... bent toward an inner bottom surface of the through hole (20); wherein the bending of the connection portion pushes the joint portion toward an inner bottom surface of the through hole to refrain movement of the body portion in the through hole ...” (Office Action, page 3).

On this basis, the Examiner asserted that “it would have been obvious ... wherein the [bent] connection portion pushes the joint portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole”. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

It is submitted that AAPA and Sakurai fails to disclose or suggest “the bending of the connection portion pushes *the head portion and the joint portion toward the inner top surface* of the through hole”. As the Examiner admitted, AAPA does not show the bending of the connection portion. Thus, AAPA would not be able to show the bending of the connection portion *pushing both the head portion and the joint portion* toward the inner top surface of the through hole.

Sakurai does not show the bending of the connection portion pushing the head portion to any surface of the through hole. In fact, in Sakurai, the head portion is combined with the protective sleeve 30. The combination of the head portion and the protective sleeve is supported by the stoppers 40 to be fixed at the center of the through hole. Thus, in Sakurai, the bending of the connection portion does not push the head portion toward any direction. For this reason, it is submitted that Sakurai fails to disclose the bending of the connection portion pushing the head portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole.

Also, the stoppers 40 are provide to fix the head portion at the center of the through hole and to prevent the head portion and the protective sleeve 30 from being pushed toward any directions. Therefore, there is no motivation to modify Sakurai such that the head portion and the protective sleeve 30 are pushed toward any directions.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and would be also patentable at least for the same reasons.

With respect to claim 13, this claim has been amended to recite “the head portion and the joint portion are *proximate to* the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole”. An example of this claimed feature is shown in Fig. 9 of the present application, in which the joint portion 267a and the head portion 267c are proximate to the inner top surface of the through hole.

Fig. 3 of AAPA shows the joint portion spaced apart from both the inner top and bottom surfaces of the through hole. Also, the head portion is spaced apart from both the inner top and bottom surface of the through hole. Thus, the joint portion and the head portion has no contribution “to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole”, as claimed.

Fig. 4 of Sakurai shows the joint portion being proximate to the inner bottoms surface of the through hole but the head portion is fixed by the stoppers 40 to be spaced apart from both the inner top and bottom surfaces of the through hole. This is a totally different structure from the claimed structure, in which the head portion is pushed toward the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole.

Thus, none of the cited references discloses the head portion being proximate to the inner surfaces of the through hole. Also, as mentioned above, there is no motivation from Sakurai to

push the head portion and the protection sleeve 30 toward any directions. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 13.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Sakurai and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,921,819 to Lee ("Lee"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 3 recites "the bending of the connection portion pushes the head portion and the joint portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole". As previously mentioned, AAPA and Sakurai, individually or as combination, fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Lee is directed to a backlight unit that is easily replaceable, but does not disclose or suggest bending of a connection portion pushing a head portion and a joint portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of a body portion in a through hole. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 3 is patentable over them. Claims 4 and 5 that are dependent from claim 3 would be also patentable at least for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 3-5.

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,533,428 to Ogo, et al. (“Ogo”) in view of Lee, further in view of Sakurai and further in view of AAPA. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 8 recites “the bending of the connection portion pushes the head portion and the join portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of the body portion in the through hole”. As previously mentioned, none

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 8-10. As previously mentioned, AAPA, Sakurai and Lee, individually or as combination, fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Ogo discloses a light guide plate including an inclined flat surface portion, where the thickness of a light guide plate decreases linearly as advancing from the lamp. However, Ogo does not disclose or suggest bending of a connection portion pushing a head portion and a joint portion toward the inner top surface of the through hole to restrain movement of a body portion in a through hole.

Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 8 is patentable over them. Claims 9 and 10 that are dependent from claim 8 would be also patentable at least for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 8-10.

Other Matters

In addition to the amendments mentioned above, claims 1, 3, 8 and 13 have been amended to clarify the claimed features and correct informalities therein.


CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 14, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

\\COM461612.1